

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	l
09/438,955	11/12/1999	RICKARD MARKS VON WURTEMBERG	21513	1076	•
7:	590 05/22/2003				

LAWRENCE E. LAUBSCHER, JR. 1160 SPA ROAD SUITE 2B ANNAPOLIS, MD 21403 EXAMINER

JACKSON, CORNELIUS H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2828

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicatio	n No.	// licant(s)	
•		09/438,95	5	VON WURTEMBE	RG ET AL.
Offic	e Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit	
		Cornelius I	ł. Jackson	2828	
	ILING DATE of this communication	on appears on the	cover sheet wi	th the correspondence ad	dress
Period for Reply					
THE MAILING - Extensions of time after SIX (6) MON - If the period for re - If NO period for re - Failure to reply wi - Any reply received earned patent term	D STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION of any be available under the provisions of 37 Country of the mailing date of this communication of the mailing date of this communication of the maximum statutory ply is specified above, the maximum statutory thin the set or extended period for reply will, by the Office later than three months after the madjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION. CFR 1.136(a). In no ever ion. 5, a reply within the stature period will apply and will 6 statute, cause the appli	nt, however, may a r tory minimum of thir expire SIX (6) MON cation to become AE	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely THS from the mailing date of this co	<i>r.</i> Immunication.
Status		47.4.4.0000			
,	sive to communication(s) filed or	_	.		
	,	This action is			
	nis application is in condition for a in accordance with the practice u				e ments is
Disposition of Cla	•		,	•	
4)⊠ Claim(s)	18-29 is/are pending in the app	lication.			
4a) Of th	e above claim(s) is/are wi	thdrawn from cor	sideration.		
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.			0 ^	
6)⊠ Claim(s)	18-29 is/are rejected.			Paul)	P
7) Claim(s)	is/are objected to.			PALIL IP	
8)⊡ Claim(s) Application Pape	are subject to restriction rs	and/or election re	quirement.	SUPERVISORY PATENT EX TECHNOLOGY CENTER	
9)∏ The spec	ification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.			
10)∏ The draw	ing(s) filed on is/are: a)□	accepted or b)	objected to by t	he Examiner.	
• •	nt may not request that any objection				
11)☐ The prop	osed drawing correction filed on	is: a)□ ap	proved b) C	lisapproved by the Examin	er.
If appro	ved, corrected drawings are required	d in reply to this Off	ice action.		
12)∐ The oath	or declaration is objected to by the	he Examiner.			
•	U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
•	edgment is made of a claim for f	oreign priority un	der 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)∐ All b)	☐ Some * c)☐ None of:				
1.□ C	ertified copies of the priority docu	ıments have beei	n received.		
	ertified copies of the priority docu				
	opies of the certified copies of the application from the Internation ttached detailed Office action for	nal Bureau (PCT	Rule 17.2(a)).		Stage
	dgment is made of a claim for do		•		application).
a) 🗌 The	translation of the foreign languaged	ge provisional ap	plication has b	een received.	
Attachment(s)	-				
1) Notice of Refere 2) Notice of Drafts	nces Cited (PTO-892) person's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 losure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper N			Summary (PTO-413) Paper No Informal Patent Application (PT	
S. Patent and Trademark Offic TO-326 (Rev. 04-01)		ffice Action Summar		Part of Paper No. 2	3

Art Unit: 2828

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment

- 1. Acknowledgment is made that applicant's Response, filed on 17 April 2003, has been entered.
- 2. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al. "Optically transparent indium-tin-oxide (ITO) ohmic contacts in the fabrication of vertical-cavity surface-emitting lasers" in view of Imai et al. (5706117) and/or Yanagawa (5287367). Martin et al. teach a surface emitting cavity laser comprising a laser stack consisting essentially of a high reflectivity mirror, a low reflectivity mirror; and an active light-amplifying region located between the high and low reflectivity mirrors; a light output port located on one side of the stack adjacent the low reflectivity mirror for transmitting light emitted by the active light-amplifying region and

Art Unit: 2828

constituting an output of the laser; and an ohmic contact on an opposite side of the stack adjacent the high reflectivity mirror, the ohmic contact being photon transparent for transmitting some of the light emitted by the light amplifying region that passes through the high reflectivity mirror, see paragraphs 1-2 (*Introduction and Fabrication*). Martin et al. fails to disclose for monitoring the light emitted by the light amplifying region that passes through the high reflectivity mirror with an external photodetector. Imai et al. (see Fig. 2) and Yanagawa (see Figs. 3-9) teach monitoring the light emitted by the light amplifying region that passes through the high reflectivity mirror with an external photodetector is well known and since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claims 21, 23, 26 and 27, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claims 19, 20, 24, 25, 28 and 29, Martin et al. teach all the stated limitations, see paragraphs 1-2 (*Introduction and Fabrication*).

Regarding claim 22, "Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

4. Claims 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (5838708) in view Jiang et al. (5751757). Lin et al. teach a surface emitting

Art Unit: 2828

cavity laser comprising a laser stack consisting essentially of a high reflectivity mirror. a low reflectivity mirror (202,206); and an active light-amplifying region 204 located between the high and low reflectivity mirrors (202,206); a light output port located on one side of the stack adjacent the low reflectivity mirror for transmitting light emitted by the active light-amplifying region and constituting an output of the laser; and a contact 236 on an opposite side of the stack adjacent the high reflectivity mirror, the contact being photon transparent for transmitting some of the light emitted by the light amplifying region that passes through the high reflectivity mirror for monitoring with an external photodetector, see col. 3, line 64-col. 5, line 59, especially col. 4, lines 43-53. Lin et al. fail to teach that the contact is ohmic. Jiang et al. teach an ohmic contact for an Schottky contact as a preferred material, see col. 4, lines 40-49 and col. 5, lines 1-27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the ohmic contact of Jiang et al. in the laser of Lin et al., since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claim 21, Lin et al. teach the contact contains an aperture to pass light therethrough, see Fig. 2.

Regarding claim 22, , Lin et al. teach the contact has a thickness between 1 and 100nm, see col. 4, lines 64-65.

Regarding claims 23 and 26, Lin et al. teach as a matter of design choice that the laser maybe a bottom emitting vertical cavity, see col. 4, lines 32-53.

Art Unit: 2828

Regarding claims 19, 24 and 28, both Lin et al. and Jiang teach the contact is made of a photon transparent material, see Lin et al., col. 5, lines 1-59 and Jiang, col. 4, lines 40-49.

Regarding claims 20, 25 and 29, Jiang teach the material comprises Indium Tin Oxide, see col. 4, lines 40-49 and col. 5, lines 1-27.

Regarding claim 27, Lin et al. teach the substrate **212** is transparent at the wavelength of the light, **see Fig. 2**

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kish, Jr. et al. (US 5724376 A) teach a surface emitting laser with a monitor

Figs.4 and 6A-B consisting essentially of a plurality of spaced apart mirrors 53 and 55,

a light amplifying region between the mirrors 51, a substrate 212, and a photon

transparent ohmic contact (contact metallization/photodetector) for passing light

energy therethrough whereby light emission through said surface emitting laser may be monitored.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cornelius H. Jackson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5981. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 5:00, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Ip can be reached on (703) 308-3098. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7721 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-

PAUL IP

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

chj

0956.

May 15, 2003